

181/01332 A06

have readily appreciated that the Bleeker's device could include a radiant heat source in view of Cheng's teaching". The Examiner's argument however does not point out *where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation* in the prior art to combine Bleeker and Cheng. Presumably the Examiner feels that the requirements of support for an obviousness rejection as indicated in *In re Fine*, and in *In re Jones* are met by the simple juxtaposition of Bleeker and Cheng. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.


Re Fine teaches that the PTO can establish a prima facie case of obviousness "only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead **that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references**". (Bold type added.) Applicants submit that all the Examiner has shown in her obviousness rejection is that the components of the present invention were extant in the prior art prior to the present invention. The Examiner **has not shown the existence of some objective teaching or knowledge generally available that would lead a representative individual of ordinary skill in the art to combine the components**.

In *In re Jones* the U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit comments that "Conspicuously missing from this record is any evidence other than the PTO's speculation (if it be called evidence) that one of ordinary skill in the herbicidal art would have been motivated to make the modifications of the prior art salts." Applicants submit that a similar assessment applies in the present case and that conspicuously missing from the record is any evidence, other than the PTO's speculation, that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Bleeker and Cheng.

In view of the above, applicants continue to maintain that the Examiner's Bleeker-Cheng obviousness rejection is untenable and that the claims of the present application are patentable.

An action on the merits is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael KOCHMAN, et al.


Dr. Paul Fenster
Reg. No. 33,877

September 24, 2003
Roy N. Envall, Jr.
c/o Anthony Castorina
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 207
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel: (703) 415-1581